REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination and in response to the Final Office Action mailed May 27th, 2004. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1- 23 are now pending in the case.

Claims 1, 8 , 18 and 19 have been amended to better claim the invention.

New Claims 20-23 have been added.

At paragraphs 2-3 of the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA).

The present invention as set forth in representative claim 1 recites:

1. A method for pre-selecting disks coupled to a storage system, the method comprising the steps of:
        obtaining, by a process running within the storage system, a set of system characteristics;
        obtaining, by said process, a plurality of disk characteristics;
        comparing, by said process, the system characteristics with the disk characteristics;
        selecting, by said process, disks whose disk characteristics match the system characteristics; and
        displaying the selected disks in a GUI and not displaying non-selected disks.

The AAPA describes a largely *"trial and error"* based method of selecting

a disk to couple to a storage system (See page 4, line 2). The AAPA teaches a

hypothetical user selects a disk, waits to see if an error occurs, and if an error

message is generated, selects another disk. While one may speculate on what

types of information a hypothetical user may remember from other sources (for

example, information remembered from prior work on the disks), or if a particu-

larly expert user might use outside information to rarely select incompatible disks,

such conjecture is beyond the scope of the AAPA.

The AAPA is summarized at page 3 line 19 through page 4 line 4 of the

Specification:

> "In a known system employing a manual approach to disk selection, a
> GUI option, screen is used to display user-selectable operations, for exam-
> ple the option to create a volume or to add a disk to a volume. The option
> screen may also show, a list of identifiers (Ids) of available disks in the
> spare pool and their size. The user can select one or more disks from the
> screen (e.g., by highlighting the selected disks in the list) in accordance
> with the requested "create" or "add" operation. The user makes the selec-
> tion in this known system *based on what the user knew of any required
> disk and volume characteristics since no such information is normally
> displayed on screen*. Since the list of spares includes all disks (even those
> not "valid" for the requested operation, e.g., due to their size or check-
> sum), *the user might select an invalid disk*. If the user selects a disk that
> is not valid and then attempts to initiate the resulting command, (by sub-
> mitting the page to the filer via HTTP for processing by the storage oper-
> ating system), an error message is generated and the command is not exe-
> cuted. *Thus, the administrator or user must go through a trial and error
> process to be able to successfully add a disk to a volume*. While suitable
> for the more sophisticated users, this manual approach manifests distinct
> disadvantages in ease of operation."

Applicant respectfully urges that the AAPA does not show Applicant's claimed invention relating to *"comparing, by said process, the system characteristics with the disk characteristics," "selecting, by said process, disks whose disk characteristics match the system characteristics,"* and *"displaying the selected disks in a GUI and not displaying non-selected disks."*

While the Examiner contends that Applicant's claimed invention merely automates the AAPA, Applicant respectfully disagrees. As stated above, the AAPA discloses a *trial and error* method for disk selection where no system or disk characteristics are displayed to a user, and where mistakes are clearly intended to be made. To that end the AAPA emphasizes the use of error messages to flag where a disk has failed as not compatible, and alert the user to select another disk. Applicant's novel invention overcomes the inefficiencies of the AAPA by performing a detailed comparison of disk and system characteristics and narrowing the user's choice to only "correct" options before selection. To this end, Applicant's invention claims a process that selects only *disks whose disk characteristics match the system characteristics* and claims *displaying the selected disks* and *not displaying non-selected disks*. Applicant's claimed invention thereby streamlines and simplifies the disk selection process. Time is save by preventing attempts to add incompatible disks, and the method is made more accessible to users who may be apprehensive of generating error messages and fearful of causing system damage.

Therefore, Applicant believes the Application is now in condition for allowance with each of the Examiner's objections and rejections addressed or traversed.

All independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

12

All dependent claims are believed to be dependent from allowable independent claims.

The Applicant respectfully solicits favorable action.

In the event that the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in disposition of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-3078.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500